

創価大学
国際仏教学高等研究所
年 報

平成24年度
(第16号)

Annual Report
of
The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology
at Soka University

for the Academic Year 2012

Volume XVI

創価大学・国際仏教学高等研究所
東京・2013・八王子

The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology
Soka University
Tokyo・2013

The Circulation of the *Buddhāvataṃsaka* in India*

Peter SKILLING (Bangkok) and SAERJI (Beijing)

This article continues research on the Tibetan *Buddhāvataṃsaka* published in ARIRIAB XV.

The protohistory and history of the *Buddhāvataṃsaka* collection and its component text units, which we describe here as the *Buddhāvataṃsaka* family of texts, pose many complex and difficult questions. A great deal remains to be done before we can understand the development and circulation of this vast florilegium, which is known primarily from “complete” Chinese and Tibetan translations.¹ The components of the collection are only partly preserved in Sanskrit, and there is so far no evidence for a complete South Asian *Buddhāvataṃsaka* corresponding to the versions attested, or suggested, by the Chinese and Tibetan translations. That is to say, there is no manuscript evidence for a unitary Indic *Buddhāvataṃsaka* collection, either from South Asia or Central Asia. As a collection, the *Buddhāvataṃsaka* is known only from Chinese and Tibetan catalogues and canons, and from references in Khotanese and other sources. In addition, outside of these collections, some of the component family members circulated independently in miscellaneous Chinese and Tibetan sūtra translations. In this article we discuss only the latter.²

We do not intend to address the questions of where or when the individual units of the *Buddhāvataṃsaka* family were composed, or where or when the “final”

* This article is part of our current research, The Tibetan Kangyur: Indian Buddhist literature in Tibetan translation, sponsored by the Khyentse Foundation. We are grateful to Dzongsar Khyentse Rinpoche and the Khyentse Foundation for their generous support.

¹ The idea (or ideal) of “complete text” or “final form” is only provisional, since the collections are not identical, and their composition changed over time. The members of the family and their genealogies and defining characteristics have scarcely been studied. For one preliminary study, see Peter Skilling and Saerji, “O, Son of the Conqueror”: A note on *jinaputra* as a term of address in the *Buddhāvataṃsaka* and in Mahāyāna sūtras,” *Annual Report of the International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhism at Soka University for the Academic Year 2011*, Vol. XV, Tokyo: The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhism, Soka University, 2012, pp. 127–130. In the article we propose that the term of address *bho jinaputra(ā)/bhavanto jinaputrā* is characteristic of the *Buddhāvataṃsaka* family of texts.

² For this research, we have used assorted Kanjurs, registers, and catalogues as accessible to us, and we are deeply grateful to individuals and institutions that have readily supplied crucial materials. In many cases it would have been useful to consult more Kanjurs, but we do not think this would have substantially affected our conclusions. Our research amply proves the *necessity* in Kanjur studies of consulting Kanjurs belonging to both the Them spangs ma and Tshal pa lineages, and local Kanjurs.

Buddhāvataṃsaka collection was compiled. One important field of investigation is the history of the long succession of Chinese translations of the components of the *Buddhāvataṃsaka* family.³ In this paper, we follow another line of enquiry, and attempt to sketch the history of the *Buddhāvataṃsaka* family according to South Asian sources. We restrict the scope of the investigation to technical *śāstra* literature of Indian origin, mainly in Sanskrit or in Tibetan translation.⁴ This enables us to demonstrate that from about the fourth to the ninth centuries CE, many of the family members circulated in South Asia in Indic-language versions, and that they did this *significantly*, insofar as they were referred to or cited as fully authoritative by leading intellectuals.

This is a preliminary survey – we do not doubt that further references to, and citations of, texts belonging to the *Buddhāvataṃsaka* family, whether by title or otherwise, remain to be studied. We hope that the present sampling is sufficient to give a general picture of the circulation of *Buddhāvataṃsaka* texts in South Asia during the fourth to the ninth centuries CE, which we might describe as the middle period of Indian Buddhism.

Our sources include the *Sūtrasamuccaya*, the *Ratnagotravibhāgavyākhyā*, the *Vyākhyāyukti* and its commentary, the *Vyākhyāyuktiṭīkā*, the *Madhyamakahrdaya-tarkajvālā*, the *Madhyamakāloka*, the *Śikṣāsamuccaya*, and the three *Bhāvanākramas*. Only the *Ratnagotravibhāgavyākhyā*, the *Śikṣāsamuccaya* and the first and last *Bhāvanākramas* survive in Sanskrit.⁵ These sources were composed during the approximate period mentioned above – approximate because, typically, not a single work can be securely dated. Further, the places of composition are not known, and attributions of authorship are often contested. In this research, we cannot reexamine the dates or identities of the authors. We refer for convenience to Nakamura and Ruegg,⁶ both of whom give reference to earlier research, and occasionally other sources, in the understanding that the dates are all provisional.

³ See the recent contributions by Jan Nattier: “The Proto-History of the *Buddhāvataṃsaka*: The *Pusa benye jing* 菩薩本業經 and the *Dousha jing* 兜沙經,” *Annual Report of the International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology at Soka University for the Academic Year 2004*, Vol. VIII, Tokyo: The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology, Soka University, 2005, pp. 323–360; “Indian Antecedents of Huayan Thought: New Light from Chinese Sources,” in Imre Hamar (ed.), *Reflecting Mirrors: Perspectives on Huayan Buddhism* (Asiatische Forschungen, Band 151), Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, 2007, pp. 109–138. In the same volume, see Ōtake Susumu, “On the Origin and Early Development of the *Buddhāvataṃsaka-sūtra*,” pp. 87–107, and Imre Hamar, “The History of the *Buddhāvataṃsaka-sūtra*: Shorter and Larger Texts,” pp. 139–167.

⁴ To investigate the large corpus of *śāstras* in Chinese translation or of Chinese compilation, for example those by Kumārajīva, is a separate field of study that requires different principles of analysis.

⁵ In the Tibetan translation, the three sections of the *Bhāvanākrama* are referred to as three progressive “stages” – *bsgom rim dang po, bar, tha ma* – rather than as chapters or sections.

⁶ Hajime Nakamura, *Indian Buddhism: A Survey with Bibliographical Notes*, Ogura, Hirakata City: Kansai University of Foreign Studies, 1980; David Seyfort Ruegg, *The Literature of the Madhyamaka School of Philosophy in India*, Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1981 (Jan Gonda [ed.], *A History of Indian Literature*, Vol. VII, Fasc. 1).

I The *Buddhāvataṃsaka* in the Land of Snows

For the study of the *Buddhāvataṃsaka*, we examine Kanjurs⁷ and Kanjur catalogues or registers.⁸

(1) *Buddhāvataṃsaka* in Kanjurs

In the Kanjurs available today, the *Buddhāvataṃsaka* is presented as a single text,⁹ divided into 45 chapters. The number of *bampos* varies,¹⁰ for example: 113 *bampos* in the Derge Kanjur,¹¹ 114 *bampos* in the Phug brag Kanjur,¹² and 115 *bampos* in the Stog Palace¹³ and Shel dkar¹⁴ Kanjurs. The chapters are numbered consecutively and continuously, but the *bampos* are numbered either consecutively and continuously in the whole section (in the Stog Palace, Shel dkar, and Phug brag Kanjurs), or within a single

⁷ For the necessity of referring to plural “Kanjurs” rather than a singular “Kanjur”, see Peter Skilling, “From bKa’ bstan bcos to bKa’ ’gyur and bsTan ’gyur,” in Helmut Eimer (ed.), *Transmission of the Tibetan Canon: Papers Presented at a Panel of the 7th Seminar of the International Association for Tibetan Studies*, Graz 1995, Vienna, pp. 87–111, especially pp. 100–101 (= Vol. III of Ernst Steinkellner [gen. ed.], *Proceedings of the 7th Seminar of the International Association for Tibetan Studies*, Graz 1995, Vienna: Beiträge zur Kultur- und Geistesgeschichte Asiens, Nr. 22 (Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philosophisch-Historische Klasse Denkschriften, 257. Band).

⁸ For the “catalogue” (*dkar chag*: register, inventory) as a genre in Tibet, see Dan Martin, “Tables of Contents (*dKar chag*),” in José Ignacio Cabezón and Roger R. Jackson (eds.), *Tibetan Literature: Studies in Genre*, Ithaca: Snow Lion, 1996, chapter 30, pp. 500–514. For the topic in question, see most recently Georgios T. Halkias, *Luminous Bliss: A Religious History of Pure Land Literature in Tibet*, Honolulu: University of Hawai’i Press, 2012, especially pp. 61–63.

⁹ The *Buddhāvataṃsaka* section of Phug brag Kanjur appends three texts to the last volume (*phal chen, ca*) of *Buddhāvataṃsaka sūtra* proper, in the following order: no. 29 (*’Phags pa za ma tog bkod pa chen po*), no. 30 (*’Phags pa byams pa lung bstan pa*), no. 31 (*’Phags pa thabs mkhas pa chen po sangs rgyas drin lan bsab pa’i mdo*): see Jampa Samten, *A Catalogue of the Phug Brag Manuscript Kanjur*, Dharamsala: Library of Tibetan Works & Archives, 1992, pp. 19–20. Cat. no. 29 (*’Phags pa za ma tog bkod pa chen po*) is also included two more times in different volumes of the *Mdo sde* section (no. 101 in vol. *mdo sde, da* and no. 381 in vol. *mdo sde, ngi*).

¹⁰ The *bampo*, a quantitative measure of length, rather than a formal textual division, is generally defined as consisting of three hundred stanzas (*śloka*s).

¹¹ This is as checked directly from the Kanjur; Hakuju Ui, Munetada Suzuki, Yenshō Kanakura, and Tōkan Tada, *A Complete Catalogue of the Tibetan Buddhist Canons (Bkaḥ-ḥgyur and Bstan-ḥgyur)*, Sendai: Tōhoku Imperial University, 1934, does not give the number of *bampos*.

¹² This is as checked directly from the Kanjur; Jampa Samten (1992) does not give the number of *bampos*.

¹³ Tadeusz Skorupski, *A Catalogue of the Stog Palace Kanjur*, Tokyo: The International Institute for Buddhist Studies, 1985, no. 10, pp. 37–41.

¹⁴ This is as checked directly from the Kanjur; Ulrich Pagel and Séan Gaffney, *Location List to the Texts in the Microfiche Edition of the Śel dkar (London) Manuscript bKa’ ’gyur (Or. 6724)*, London: The British Library, 1996, does not give the number of *bampos*.

volume only (in the Derge, Bathang,¹⁵ and Gondhla¹⁶ Kanjurs). There is only one opening title at the beginning and only one colophon at the end of this literally voluminous text. That is, individual components which are well-known today under their own names, for example the *Gaṇḍavyūha* or *Daśabhūmika* sūtras, do not open with their own titles in “the language of India” and “the language of Tibet” (*rgya gar skad du, bod skad du*), and do not end with their own translators’ colophons, as independent sūtras usually do. It seems that the component parts of the Tibetan *Buddhāvataṃsaka* have all been merged into one single and continuous work, with one important exception. This is the *Daśabhūmika* sūtra, which occurs not only as a chapter of the *Buddhāvataṃsaka* section, but also as an independent sūtra in Kanjurs belonging to the Them spangs ma branch like Stog Palace,¹⁷ Ulan Bator,¹⁸ Shel dkar,¹⁹ and in local Kanjurs like Phug brag.²⁰ In these cases, it has its own individual title and a concluding colophon. The *Daśabhūmika* is also preserved in Dunhuang manuscripts.²¹ After checking the Kanjurs available to us as well as the Dunhuang manuscript,²² we found that Dunhuang manuscript no. 82 and the independent sūtra preserved in the Them spangs ma branch are the same translation, and that this translation is different from that embedded in the *Buddhāvataṃsaka* section.²³ In other words, two different recensions of the *Daśabhūmika* are preserved in Tibetan.²⁴

¹⁵ Helmut Eimer, *A Catalogue of the Kanjur Fragment from Bathang Kept in the Newark Museum* (Wiener Studien zur Tibetologie und Buddhismuskunde, Heft 75), Vienna: Arbeitskreis für Tibetische und Buddhistische Studien, Universität Wien, 2012.

¹⁶ Helmut Tauscher, *Catalogue of the Gondhla Proto-Kanjur* (Wiener Studien zur Tibetologie und Buddhismuskunde, Heft 72), Vienna: Arbeitskreis für Tibetische und Buddhistische Studien, Universität Wien, 2008.

¹⁷ Tadeusz Skorupski (1985), no. 38, p. 83.

¹⁸ Géza Bethlenfalvy, *A Hand-List of the Ulan Bator Manuscript of the Kanjur Rgyal-rtse Them Spangs-ma* (Debter, Deb-ther, Debtelin – Materials for Central Asiatic and Altaic Studies 1: Fontes Tibetani 1), Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1982, no. 85, p. 21. According to the editor, the volume which should contain “*Sa bcu pa'i mdo*” is missing.

¹⁹ Ulrich Pagel and Séan Gaffney (1996), no. 14, p. 18.

²⁰ Jampa Samten (1992), no. 349, p. 128. For the Them spangs ma and other branches of the Kanjur, see P. Skilling, “From bKa' bstan bcos to bKa' 'gyur and bTan 'gyur,” and Helmut Eimer (2012), pp. xvii–xxi.

²¹ Louis de la Vallée Poussin, *Catalogue of the Tibetan Manuscripts from Tun-huang in the India Office Library*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1962, nos. 82–86, 88, p. 34; no. 132, p. 51.

²² We have examined the Stog Palace, Shel dkar, and Phug brag Kanjurs, and Dunhuang manuscripts nos. 82, 83, 85, 86, 132.

²³ Apart from no. 82, which consists of 66 folios, the Dunhuang manuscripts are fragments, preserving only several folios. Among them, no. 132 merits special notice: it consists of only one folio, but it preserves a translation colophon which states that this sūtra belongs to the *Bodhisatvapīṭaka*, the *Buddhāvataṃsaka-mahāyāna-sūtra* (*byang cub sems dpa'i sde snod | sangs rgyas phal po che theg pa chen po'i mdo la rims kyis | thams cad mkhyen pa'i ye shes kyi 'byung gnas shes bya ba sa bcu pa bstan pa'i le'u rdzogs so*). It gives the translators as Surendrabodhi and Ye shes sde. Because Tibetan tradition ascribes the whole *Buddhāvataṃsaka* section to the same translation team, we do not know to which of the two *Daśabhūmikas* the Dunhuang colophon fragments belongs.

²⁴ Jampa Samten noted that the Phug brag version is different from that preserved in the *Avataṃsaka* section: see Jampa Samten (1992), p. 128, n. 2.

(2) *Buddhāvataṃsaka* in the early registers

When we turn to the registers of translated texts compiled during the early period of translation, however, the picture is quite different. Out of the three early registers that are mentioned by scholars like Bcom ldan rig pa'i ral gri (1227–1305) or Bu ston Rin chen grub (1290–1364), only two are available at present: the *'Phang thang ma* and the *Lhan dkar ma*. A third, the *Mchims phu ma*, is not known to survive. In the two available registers, the *Buddhāvataṃsaka* is a primary category or class under which a series of titles are grouped. Each of the individual units given under the primary category *Buddhāvataṃsaka* is counted separately in terms of *bampos*, implying that they once existed as independent physical manuscripts.

In both registers, the *Buddhāvataṃsaka* is the second section, following the *Prajñāpāramitā* (*Shes phyin*). In the *Lhan dkar ma*, the *Buddhāvataṃsaka* is the second out of thirty sections; in the *'Phang thang ma*, it is the second out of twenty-seven or thirty-two sections.²⁵ In later registers like those of Bcom ldan rig pa'i ral gri or Bu ston Rin chen grub, or in most Kanjurs, the *Buddhāvataṃsaka* also follows the *Prajñāpāramitā* to make the second section. This privileged position reflects the exalted status of the *Buddhāvataṃsaka*.

The registers do not give Sanskrit titles. In the following, we assign Sanskrit titles according to those given in the Sanskrit texts studied here or in the *Mahāvīyutpatti* (for which see below).²⁶ This research allows us to correct some of the Sanskrit titles which have been wrongly reconstructed in modern research.

(2.1) *The 'Phang thang ma register*

Section 2 of the *'Phang thang ma* register lists only five titles “belonging to the Exalted Great Extensive Buddhāvataṃsaka Sūtra,” in the following order:²⁷

[18] **Āryabuddhāvataṃsakavaipūlyasūtra*

'Phags pa shin tu rgyas pa'i mdo sangs rgyas phal po che

[19] *Āryalokottaraparivarta*

'Phags pa 'jig rten las 'das pa'i le'u

²⁵ The first figure is according to Kawagoe, the second according to Halkias. See Eishin Kawagoe, *dKar chag 'Phang thang ma* (Tohoku Society for Indo-Tibetan Studies Monograph Series 3), Sendai: Tohoku Society for Indo-Tibetan Studies, 2005; Georgios T. Halkias, “Tibetan Buddhism Registered: A Catalogue from the Imperial Court of 'Phang thang,” *The Eastern Buddhist*, New Series vol. 36, nos. 1–2, 2004, pp. 46–105.

²⁶ In the following, we reconstruct the Sanskrit titles individually, without any attempt to standardize, in each case keeping as close as possible to the original Tibetan — with or without *Ārya*, with or without final elements like *–parivarta*, *–sūtra*, etc. When there is no original Sanskrit evidence for a title, we prefix it with an asterisk.

²⁷ *'Phags pa shin du rgyas pa chen po sangs rgyas phal po che'i mdo sder gtogs pa*: the numbers follow Kawagoe (2005).

[20] *Āryabodhisatvadaśabhūmika*²⁸

'Phags pa byang chub sems dpa'i sa bcu

[21] *Āryaratnolkā*

'Phags pa dkon mchog ta la la

[22] *Tathāgatotpattisambhavanirdeśa*

De bzhin gshegs pa skye ba 'byung ba bstan pa.

(2.2) *The Lhan dkar ma register*

Section 2 of the *Lhan dkar ma* lists eight titles “belonging to the extensive sūtras of the Mahāyāna,” in the following order:²⁹

[17] *Āryabuddhāvataṃsakanāmamahāvaipūlyasūtra*

'Phags pa shin tu rgyas pa chen po'i sde sangs rgyas phal po che

[18] **Tathāgatāvataṃsakaparivarta*

De bzhin gshegs pa phal po che'i le'u

[19] **Bodhisatvavajradhvajaparīṇāmaparivarta*

Byang chub sems dpa' rdo rje rgyal mtshan gyis yongs su bsngo ba'i le'u

[20] *Āryabodhisatvadaśabhūmikanirdeśa*

'Phags pa byang chub sems dpa'i sa bcu bstan pa

[21] *Āryasamantabhadracaryānirdeśa*³⁰

'Phags pa kun du bzang po'i spyod pa bstan pa

[22] *Āryatathāgatotpattisambhavanirdeśa*

'Phags pa de bzhin gshegs pa skye ba 'byung ba bstan pa

[23] *Āryalokottaraparivarta*

'Phags pa 'jig rten las 'das pa'i le'u

²⁸ We prefer to follow the mainstream Buddhist Sanskrit usage of manuscripts and inscriptions by spelling “bodhisatva” with a single rather than a double “t”. See Gouriswar Bhattacharya, “How to Justify the Spelling of the Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit Term Bodhisatva?,” in Eli Franco and Monika Zin (eds.), *From Turfan to Ajanta: Festschrift for Dieter Schlingloff on the Occasion of his Eightieth Birthday*, Rupandehi: Lumbini International Research Institute, 2010, Vol. II, pp. 35–50. Note that this is also the preferred spelling in Khotanese, in Tibetan lexicography, and in old Thai documents. See n. 38 below.

²⁹ *Theg pa chen po'i mdo sde shin tu rgyas pa'i phyogs su gtogs pa*: the numbers follow Adelheid Herrmann-Pfandt, *Die lhan kar ma: ein früher Katalog der ins Tibetische übersetzten buddhistischen Texte; kritische Neuauflage mit Einleitung und Materialien* (Denkschriften / Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften. Philosophisch-Historische Klasse, 367. Bd.), Vienna: Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, 2008, pp. 12–17. We have corrected the Sanskrit titles given by Herrmann-Pfandt for nos. 22 and 23 according to the forms given in the *Mahāvīyutpatti*, *Śikṣāsamuccaya* and *Bhāvanākrama*.

³⁰ This refers to *Kun tu bzang po'i spyod pa bstan pa'i le'u*, chapter 42 of the Tibetan *Buddhāvataṃsaka* (= chapter 36 of Śikṣānanda's Chinese version). It should not be confused with the *Samantabhadracaryāpraṇidhāna*, which, when it rounds off the *Buddhāvataṃsaka* collection, is placed at the end of the *Gaṇḍavyūha*. The *Samantabhadracaryāpraṇidhāna*, which to the present day is recited daily in some monastic traditions in Tibet and China, goes under several titles, such as *Bhadracarī(-ī)*, *Bhadracarīyāpraṇidhāna*, *Samantabhadracaryāpraṇidhāna*.

[24] *Āryagaṇḍavyūhasūtra*

'Phags pa sdong po bkod pa'i mdo.

The *Lhan dkar ma* list is noticeably different from that of the *'Phang thang ma* in that it does not include the *Āryaratnolkā* (no. 21 in the latter), which it places in Section 5, “Sūtras of the Great Vehicle” (*Theg pa chen po'i mdo sde*). The colophons of the Stog Palace, Ulan Bator and Shel dkar Kanjurs describe the *Ratnolkā* as “from the Great Extensive Sūtra, Exalted *Buddhāvataṃsaka*,” and thus agree with the *'Phang thang ma*.³¹ The Stog Palace and Ulan Bator Kanjurs represent the Them spangs ma branch of the Kanjur; this information is also preserved in local Kanjurs, like the Phug brag³² and Bathang³³ Kanjurs, but not in representatives of the Tshal pa branch like the Derge and Peking Kanjurs.³⁴ The *Ratnolkā* is indeed incorporated into the Tibetan translation of the *Buddhāvataṃsaka* (as we will see below), although it is split into two non-consecutive chapters in a different sequence.³⁵

³¹ *Shin tu rgyas pa chen po'i mdo 'phags pa sangs rgyas phal po che las | dkon mchog ta la la zhes bya ba'i gzungs kyi chos kyi rnam grangs rdzogs so.* Cf. Skorupski (1985), no. 127, p. 108. We are grateful to Paul Harrison for supplying copies of the relevant folios of the Ulan Bator Kanjur.

³² Jampa Samten (1992), no. 348, p. 128.

³³ Eimer (2012), no. 155, p. 109.

³⁴ In the Them spangs ma branch and local Kanjurs listed above, the *Ratnolkā* occurs in the Sūtra (*Mdo*, *Mdo sde*, *Mdo mangs*, etc.) section. In the Derge Kanjur, it occurs in both the Sūtra and Dhāraṇī sections (nos. 145 and 847); in the Peking Kanjur, it occurs in the Tantra (*Rgyud*) section (no. 473). In the Mustang Kanjur catalogue, it occurs as many as four times: in the Tantra (no. 116), *Gzungs 'dus* (no. 122), *Gzungs 'bum* (no. 303), and Sūtra (no. 562) sections (see Helmut Eimer, *The Early Mustang Kanjur Catalogue, A Structured Edition of the Mdo sngags bka' 'gyur dkar chag and of Nor chen kun dga' bzañ po's bka' 'gyur ro cog gi dkar chag bstan pa gsal ba'i sgron me* [Wiener Studien zur Tibetologie und Buddhismuskunde, Heft 45], Vienna: Arbeitskreis für Tibetische und Buddhistische Studien, Universität Wien, 1999). In his catalogue, Bcom ldan rig pa'i ral gri stated that the *Ratnolkā* had apparently been removed from the *Avataṃsaka* and placed in the Dhāraṇī section: but since it is not dhāraṇī, it should be counted as belonging to the *Buddhāvataṃsaka* (*dkon mchog ta la la bam po lnga ste gung [sic! we read gud] na yod do | 'di'i shin tu rgyas pa chen po'i mdo sangs rgyas phal po che las zhes bya ba phyi nas gzungs 'dus su bcug nas snang ste | 'di gzungs ma yin pas phal chen gyi lta la gzugs so*), cf. Kurtis R. Schaeffer and Leonard W. J. van der Kuijp (eds.), *An Early Tibetan Survey of Buddhist Literature: The Bstan pa rgyas pa rgyan gyi nyi 'od of Bcom ldan ral gri* (Harvard Oriental Series, vol. 64), Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 2009, pp.118–119. In his history of Buddhism, Bu ston Rin chen grub notes that some people list the *Ratnolkā* in the Tantra section, but that this is wrong, because the catalogues which distinguish sūtra and tantra without mixing them up, take it as a sūtra (*'dir kha cig gis ... dkon mchog ta la la ... la sogs pa bris pa ni nor ba yin te mdo dang rgyud ma 'dres par phyi ba'i dkar chag dag tu mdor bshad pa'i phyir ro*), cf. Soshū Nishioka, ““Putun Bukkyōshi” mokurokubusakuin III,” *Tōkyō Daigaku Bungakubu Bunka Kōryū Kenkyū Shisetsu Kenkyū Kiyō* 6, 1983, pp. 64–65.

³⁵ Our tentative conclusion is that the *Ratnolkā* can be divided into five parts (at least in the Derge version). The second part corresponds to chapter 20 of the Tibetan *Buddhāvataṃsaka*, the fourth part to chapter 17. The fifth part is a single stock concluding line, while two parts have no counterpart. Further comparison is needed. The *Ratnolkā* was translated into Chinese by Fa Tian 法天 during the Northern Sung dynasty, and during the Ming dynasty, the renowned Chinese master Zhi xu 智旭 (1599–1655) noticed the correspondences between the *Ratnolkā* and the *Buddhāvataṃsaka* in his *Yue zang zhi jin* 閱藏知津 [Annotated Catalogue of Chinese Tripiṭaka]. Cf. *Taishō shinshū daizōkyō* 大正新脩大藏經, appended

(2.3) *The Mahāvvyutpatti (Bye brag tu rtogs par byed pa chen po)*

The *Mahāvvyutpatti*, a thematically ordered register of officially sanctioned Tibetan equivalents of Sanskrit terms, was composed by royal command at an uncertain date, probably commencing in 814 CE. A section entitled “Names of the Saddharma” (§ 1325, *Dam pa'i chos kyi ming*) lists the titles of 104 texts, of which 85 are sūtra, etc. titles.³⁶ The opening texts are:³⁷

[S 1326] *Śatasāhasrikāprajñāpāramitā*

Shes rab kyi pha rol tu phyin pa stong phrag brgya pa

[S 1327] *Pañcaviṃśatisāhasrikā*

Nyi khri lnga stong pa

[S 1328] *Aṣṭasāhasrikā*

Brgyad stong pa

[S 1329] *Buddhāvataṃsakam*

Sangs rgyas phal po che

[S 1330] *Bodhisatvapiṭakam*³⁸

Byang chub sems dpa'i sde snod.

The hierarchy of the opening titles of the *Mahāvvyutpatti* seems to be determined by length combined with category, although the significance of *Bodhisatvapiṭaka* here is not clear. Does the *Mahāvvyutpatti* intend to refer to the collection of Bodhisatva texts, to a separate *Piṭaka*, frequently mentioned in literature but no longer extant (and of which even the contents or components are not known)? Or is it referring to the individual sūtra, a long text included in Tibetan translation in the *Mahāratnakūṭa* collection, available in Sanskrit fragments from Central Asia, and recently in a complete manuscript from the Potala in Lhasa?³⁹

After this, the *Mahāvvyutpatti* lists titles of individual sūtras. There does not seem to be any particular order, or, at least, the principles of the sequence are not clear to us —

volume III, no. 271, 799a22–b10.

³⁶ S 1411 to S 1414 list the components of the Tripiṭaka, followed by the titles of six books of the Abhidharma (S 1415–1420), the four Āgamas (S 1421–1424), and the four books or sections of the Vinaya (S 1425–1428). The section closes somewhat enigmatically with the *Rājāvavādaka* (*Rgyal po la gdams pa*).

³⁷ 榊亮三郎編著《梵藏漢和四譯對校翻譯名義大集》京都帝國大學文科大学叢書3, 京都：真言宗京都大學, 1916年, 1925年(初版), 東京：鈴木學術財團, 1973年(第五次印刷) [Ryōzaburō Sakaki, (ed.), *Mahāvvyutpatti*, parts 1 and 2, Kyoto: Kyoto Imperial University, 1916 and 1925]. We give the Sanskrit titles (with Sakaki numbers) as in the *Mahāvvyutpatti* and do not attempt to standardize them against other lists or sources.

³⁸ In the *Mahāvvyutpatti*, the term *bodhisatva* occurs ten times: it is consistently transcribed in Tibetan (at least in the Derge version) with single “t”: see D 4346, *sna tshogs*, co, 9b3; 15b1; 16b5 (twice); 20b1, 3, 5; 28b3; 45a5; 89a1.

³⁹ Jens Braarvig and Ulrich Pagel, “Fragments from the Bodhisattvapiṭaka,” in Jens Braarvig, Paul Harrison, Jens-Uwe Hartmann, Kazunobu Matsuda and Lore Sander (eds.), *Buddhist Manuscripts in the Schøyen Collection*, Oslo: Hermes Publishing, 2006, pp. 11–88. The Potala manuscript has not yet been published.

the sequence does not follow size, genre (for example, *sūtra*, *nirdeśa*, *paripṛcchā*, *vyūha*), or category (for example, *Ratnakūṭa*, *Prajñāpāramitā*, *Dhāraṇī*). The *Mahāvīyutpatti* lists the following members of the *Buddhāvataṃsaka* family, but does not group them together or give any indication of their relation to the *Buddhāvataṃsaka*:

[S 1334] *Lokottaraparivartaḥ*

'*Jig rten las 'das pa'i le'u*

[S 1341] *Gaṇḍavyūhaḥ*

Sdong po bkod pa

[S 1350] *Daśabhūmikam*

Sa bcu pa

[S 1375] *Ratnolkā*

Dkon mchog ta la la

[S 1376] *Gocarapariśuddham*

Spyod yul yongs su dag pa

[S 1378] *Tathāgatopattisambhavanirdeśaḥ*

De bzhin gshegs pa skye ba 'byung ba bstan pa.

In addition to the texts mentioned above, we can add two further texts to the *Buddhāvataṃsaka* family: the *Tathāgatagaṇajñānācintyaṣayāvatāranirdeśa* (D 185) and the *Śraddhābalādhānāvatāramudrā* (D 201). As we will see below, there is evidence to indicate that these two sūtras are associated with the *Buddhāvataṃsaka*.⁴⁰

The Stog Palace Kanjur preserves a text entitled *Mdo sde snyan gyi gong rgyan zhes bya ba theg pa chen po'i mdo*. A preliminary study reveals that the text corresponds to chapters 9 and 10 of Tibetan *Buddhāvataṃsaka*.⁴¹ The text is also included in the Ulan Bator Kanjur,⁴² but not in the Shel dkar or in other Kanjurs like Derge and Peking, or in local Kanjurs like Phug brag. Nor is it available in the surviving volumes of incomplete local Kanjurs like those from Gondhla or Bathang, but in the absence of registers of their complete contents it is impossible to know whether or not they included this text. Both the Stog Palace and the Ulan Bator Kanjurs give the translator's name as Ce Btsan skyes. A text translated by a Che Btsan skyes together with Dharmabodhi and Dānarakṣita is included in the *Rnying rgyud* section of the Derge Kanjur (D 829); it bears the long title *De bzhin gshegs pa thams cad kyi thugs gsang ba'i ye shes don gyi snying po rdo rje bkod*

⁴⁰ Ōtake Susumu, "On the Origin and Early Development of the *Buddhāvataṃsaka-sūtra*," in Imre Hamar (ed.), *ibid.* pp. 96 ff.

⁴¹ The text mentions two chapter titles, that of chapter 9 (150b4): '*jig rten gyi khams kyi rigs nam par gzhag pa'i sgra ma lus pa zhes bya ba bsgyur ba dgu po rdzogs so*; and that given in the concluding colophon (166b4–5: see Skorupski [1985], no. 248, p. 140): *sangs rgyas kyi snyan gyi gong rgyan las shin tu rgya che ba'i theg pa chen po bshad pa nam par snang mdzad kyi le'u zhes bya ba theg pa chen po'i rgyud rdzogs so*.

⁴² *Sangs rgyas kyi snyan gyi gong rgyan zhes bya ba theg pa chen po'i mdo*: Bethlenfalvy (1982), no. 296, p. 31.

pa'i rgyud rnal 'byor grub pa'i lung kun 'dus rig pa'i mdo theg pa chen po mngon par rtogs pa chos kyī rnam grangs rnam par bkod pa zhes bya ba'i rgyud. The Derge Kanjur colophon states that it was translated from the Bru zha language in the Bru zha area (Gilgit?);⁴³ the text opens with customary (but not necessarily authentic) Sanskrit and Bru zha titles.⁴⁴ The same text is also included in the *Rnying ma rgyud 'bum*, the colophon of which gives the same information as does the Derge Kanjur.⁴⁵ According to the *Blue Annals*, Che Btsan skyes, who came from Bru zha, translated the *Mdo dgongs pa 'dus pa*, and was teacher of Gnubs chen Sangs rgyas ye shes.⁴⁶

II The *Buddhāvataṃsaka* in South Asia

Now that we have reviewed the structure and history of the *Buddhāvataṃsaka* in the Land of Snows, let us return to South Asia. Scholars have long been familiar with the two sections of the *Buddhāvataṃsaka* that have been preserved in complete Sanskrit manuscripts in Nepal:

[1] *Daśabhūmika*

[2] *Gaṇḍavyūha*.

These are transmitted independently as palm-leaf and paper manuscripts. They have ritual functions, and have often been described in the literature since the time of Brian Hodgson (1800–1894) as belonging to the “Nine Dharmas,” a category that denotes ceremonial rather than “canonical” status.⁴⁷

Recently, the *Anantabuddhakṣetraguṇodbhāvananāmamahāyānasūtra* has been published in a collection of twenty Sanskrit sūtras.⁴⁸ The Sanskrit colophon describes the sūtra as “from the *Buddhāvataṃsaka*, the Extensive Basket.”⁴⁹ A few fragments of the

⁴³ 290a6: *Rgya gar gyi mkhan po dharmabodhi dang | ring lugs chen po dānarakṣita dang | zhu chen gyi lo tsā ba che btsan skyes kyis bru sha'i yi ge las bru sha'i yul gyi khrom du bsgyur cing gtan la phab pa*.

⁴⁴ The Bru zha title (86b1–2) is *Hon pan ril til pi bu pi til ti ta shing 'un 'ub hang pang ril 'ub pi su bang ri zhe hal pa'i ma kyang ku'i dang rong ti*.

⁴⁵ *The Mtshams-brag manuscript of the Rñin ma rgyud 'bum*, Thimphu: 1982, TBRC version, vol. 16, ma, 309a3–4.

⁴⁶ 'Gos lo gzhon nu dpal gyis brtsams, *Deb ther sngon po*, Chengdu: Si khron mi rigs dpe skrun khang, 1984, p. 137: *khong (snubs sangs rgyas ye shes rin po che) gi bla ma bru sha'i lo tsā ba che btsan skyes kyis mdo dgongs pa 'dus pa bod du bsgyur ba*. For an English translation, see George N. Roerich, (tr.), *The Blue Annals*, Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1976 (second edition), p. 104.

⁴⁷ See Brian Houghton Hodgson, *Essays on the Languages, Literature and Religion of Nepal and Tibet: together with further papers on the geography, ethnology, and commerce of those countries* [London: Trübner & Co., 1874] repr. 1972 with introduction by Philip Denwood (Bibliotheca Himalayica Series II Volume 7), New Delhi: Mañjuśrī Publishing House, 1972.

⁴⁸ Vinita Tseng (ed. and tr.), *A Unique Collection of Twenty Sūtras in a Sanskrit Manuscript from the Potala* (Sanskrit Texts from the Tibetan Autonomous Region 7/1, 2), Vienna: Austrian Academy of Sciences Press / Beijing: China Tibetology Publishing House, 2010, pp. 557–593. This is chapter 37 of the Tibetan *Buddhāvataṃsaka*; it also exists in two independent Tibetan translations (D 104 and D 268).

⁴⁹ *Buddhāvataṃsakād vaipulyaṭīkāṭ*: *ibid.* p. 582. Note that the two independent Tibetan translations (D 104 and 268) do not give this detail.

Buddhāvataṃsaka from Central Asia have been identified in the Hoernle collection in the British Library, London. These are written on paper in Southern Turkestan Brāhmī, and date to the sixth century or later.⁵⁰ These finds have added to the corpus of *Buddhāvataṃsaka* texts in Sanskrit. In this paper, we study the *Buddhāvataṃsaka* in India from the perspective of citations in Indian *śāstra* literature both in Sanskrit and in Tibetan translation.

(1) *Buddhāvataṃsaka* in the *Sūtrasamuccaya*

The date, authorship, and provenance of the *Sūtrasamuccaya* are all problematic.⁵¹ At present, only two small Sanskrit fragments of the *Sūtrasamuccaya* from Central Asia have been identified;⁵² for our purposes, we study this anthology as attested by the Tibetan translation by Jinamitra, Śīlendrabodhi, and Ye shes sde.⁵³ The *Sūtrasamuccaya*

⁵⁰ Seishi Karashima and Klaus Wille (editors-in-chief), *Buddhist Manuscripts from Central Asia: The British Library Sanskrit Fragments*, Volume II.1, 2, Tokyo: The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhism, Soka University, 2009, especially p. 28. Most of the fragments belong to the *Gaṇḍavyūha*; Shin'ichirō Hori, however, has identified a few fragments from the early chapters of the *Buddhāvataṃsaka*, and at least one fragment from the *Lokottaraparivarta*: see Shin'ichirō Hori, "Sanskrit Fragments of the *Buddhāvataṃsaka* from Central Asia," in Robert Gimello, Frédéric Girard, Imre Hamar, (eds.) *Avataṃsaka Buddhism in East Asia: Huayan, Kegon, Flower Ornament Buddhism. Origins and Adaptation of a Visual Culture* (Asiatische Forschungen 155), Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, 2012, pp. 15–35. We are grateful to Prof. Hori for sending an off-print of his article.

⁵¹ The dating is contingent on whether or not the anthology was compiled by Nāgārjuna, on whether or not this Nāgārjuna was the same as the famed author of the *Mūlamadhyamaka-kārikā*, and if that is the case, on Nāgārjuna's date. See most recently, with references to earlier literature, Bhikkhu Pāsādika, "Der Mahāyāna-Buddhismus gemäss Nāgārjunas Sūtrasamuccaya," in *Hōrin: Vergleichende Studien zur Japanischen Kultur*, vol. 10 (2004), pp. 73–96, and idem, "Sūtrasamuccaya," *Encyclopaedia of Buddhism*, Vol. VIII, Fascicle 1, Sri Lanka: The Department of Buddhist Affairs, Ministry of Religious Affairs, 2007, pp. 203–205. If the *Sūtrasamuccaya* is by another, later Nāgārjuna, then we have even less to go on, since several later Nāgārjunas have been proposed, not because there is any compelling historical or biographical evidence for them, but as expediences to explain traditional attributions of tantric, medical, or other works to "Nāgārjuna" – works which, in the eyes of modern scholarship, cannot possibly be by the Nāgārjuna. Most strictly, the lower date of the *Sūtrasamuccaya* is the date of the earliest evidence, the Sanskrit fragments from Khādalik (IOL San 964 and IOL San 966: see Seishi Karashima, "A Sanskrit Fragment of the *Sūtrasamuccaya* from Central Asia," in Martin Straube, Roland Steiner, Jayandra Soni, Michael Hahn, and Mitsuyo Demoto [eds.], *Pāsādikadānam. Festschrift für Bhikkhu Pāsādika* [Indica et Tibetica no. 52], Marburg: 2009, pp. 264–273), which, written in South Turkestan Brāhmī (main type), should date from the fifth to sixth centuries. As long as authorship remains unknown or uncertain, all that can be said is that the *Sūtrasamuccaya* is older than the Khādalik fragment. In this study, however, we must bear in mind the possibility that the *Sūtrasamuccaya* is by the Nāgārjuna (following Karashima 2009, c. 150–250 CE), in which case the earliest evidence for the circulation in India of texts belonging to the *Buddhāvataṃsaka* family would be the mid-second to mid-third centuries CE. Nakamura states that the date c. 150–250 CE "is accepted by most Japanese scholars" (Nakamura [1980], p. 235, n. 4). For the range of dates assigned to Nāgārjuna up to the 1970s, see David Seyfort Ruegg (1981), p. 4, n. 611.

⁵² See n. 51, reference to Seishi Karashima (2009).

⁵³ We have consulted Bhikkhu Pāsādika, *Nāgārjunas Sūtrasamuccaya: A Critical Edition of the mDo kun las btus pa*, København: Akademisk Forlag, 1989.

cites the members of the *Buddhāvataṃsaka* family under seven individual titles, without relating them to the broader *Buddhāvataṃsaka* category, with the exception of no. 6:

[1] *Daśabhūmikasūtra*

Sa bcu'i mdo sde

[2] *Tathāgatotpattisambhavasūtra*

De bzhin gshegs pa sbye ba srid pa'i mdo

[3] *Lokottaraparivarta*

'Jig rten las 'das pa'i le'u

[4] *Gaṇḍavyūhasūtra*

Sdong po bkod pa'i mdo

[5] *Tathāgatagaṇajñānācintya viśayāvatāranirdeśa*

De bzhin gshegs pa'i yon tan dang ye shes bsam gyis mi khyab pa'i yul la 'jug pa bstan pa'i mdo

[6] *Buddhāvataṃsakasūtra*

Sangs rgyas phal po che'i mdo

[7] *Śraddhābalādhānāvatāramudrā*

Dad pa'i stobs bskyed pa la 'jug pa'i phyag rgya'i mdo.

The *Sūtrasamuccaya* cites nos. 1, 2, and 3 once each. It quotes the *Gaṇḍavyūhasūtra* six times, both under the title *Gaṇḍavyūha* and under the name of individual *vimokṣas*.⁵⁴ It cites the fifth text two times; one of these is a selective quotation, but is quite long.

The last two titles need special attention. The three *Sūtrasamuccaya* citations of “the (or a?) *Buddhāvataṃsaka*” all correspond to the *Śraddhābalādhānāvatāramudrā*, which the same *Sūtrasamuccaya* also quotes twice under the title *Dad pa'i stobs bskyed pa la 'jug pa'i phyag rgya'i mdo*. The same author or text cites one and the same sūtra under two different titles – one the specific title of the sūtra, the other that of the *Buddhāvataṃsaka* collection. How can we explain this discrepancy? But the question is even more complicated than this: the *Sūtrasamuccaya* also cites a similar title, *Dad pa'i stobs bskyed pa'i mdo*, as many as three times. At first glance, the title should indicate the *Śraddhābalādhāna-(avatāramudrā)-sūtra*, but these citations do not occur anywhere in the extant Tibetan or Chinese versions of the sūtra. The situation is as follows:

Buddhāvataṃsaka (*Sangs rgyas phal po che'i mdo*, 3 citations) = *Dad pa'i stobs bskyed pa la 'jug pa'i phyag rgya'i mdo*

Dad pa'i stobs bskyed pa la 'jug pa'i phyag rgya'i mdo (2 citations): verified in both Tibetan and Chinese translations under this title.

Dad pa'i stobs bskyed pa'i mdo (3 citations): not found in the sūtra (Tibetan or Chinese).

⁵⁴ This system of classification refers to chapters by the name of the spiritual friend, *kalyāṇamitra*, followed by *vimokṣa*, liberation, with the sense of the “liberation taught by so and so,” for example, *yathā-ārya-maitreyavimokṣe*.

The *Sūtrasamuccaya* definitely knows a version of the *Śraddhābalādhānāvātāramudrā*, to which it refers both under the name *Buddhāvataṃsaka* and under its own title, since the *Sūtrasamuccaya* cites a further three passages which cannot be traced in the extant versions, if we take the *Dad pa'i stobs bskyed pa'i mdo* as the *Śraddhābalādhānāvātāramudrā* proper (as the later Chinese version of *Sūtrasamuccaya* has indeed done), this version may have been different than the one extant today in Tibetan and Chinese translation. On the other hand, we cannot exclude the possibility that here *Dad pa'i stobs bskyed pa'i mdo* indicates a different sūtra which only shares a similar title with the text in question.

(2) *Ratnagotravibhāgavyākhyā*

The *Ratnagotravibhāgavyākhyā*, of which the full title is *Ratnagotravibhāga Mahāyānottaratantraśāstravyākhyā*, is preserved in Sanskrit⁵⁵ and in Tibetan and Chinese translations. The Tibetan version was translated by Sajjana and Blo ldan shes rab in the eleventh century; the Chinese translation is ascribed to Ratnamati (Le na mo ti, 勒那摩提), a monk from “Central India” (*zhong tianzhu*, 中天竺), in the early sixth century. Tibetan tradition ascribes the text to Asaṅga (c. 310–390),⁵⁶ but the Chinese translation gives the author’s name as *Sāramati (Jian Yi, 堅意, 350–450).⁵⁷ The *Ratnagotravibhāgavyākhyā* quotes the *Tathāgatotpattisambhava* twice.⁵⁸ One of the quotations is quite long, but neither of the citations is given a title.⁵⁹ At the beginning, the *Ratnagotravibhāgavyākhyā* quotes the *Tathāgatagūṇajñānācintyaṇiṣayāvatāranirdeśa* as an authority;⁶⁰ the passage corresponds to part of a much longer citation in the

⁵⁵ E. H. Johnston (ed. and tr.), *The Ratnagotravibhāga Mahāyānottara-tantraśāstra*, Patna: Bihar Research Society, 1950, an edition based primarily on two palm-leaf Sanskrit manuscripts photographed in Tibet by Rāhula Sāṅkrīyāyana, “A” written in early Śāradā script, perhaps dating to the tenth century, and “B” in “a Nepali script of the XI century.” The films are preserved in Patna.

⁵⁶ Date after Nakamura (1980), p. 264.

⁵⁷ Ibid. p. 261.

⁵⁸ D 4025, 86a3–87a6; 94a7–b1; cf. Johnston (1950), pp. 22.10–24.8; 36.16–37.1.

⁵⁹ The Chinese version of the *Ratnagotravibhāgavyākhyā* gives a reference for the second citation, saying that it is from *Huayan xingqi* 華嚴性起, which indicates the (*Tathāgata-jutpattisambhava* chapter of *Buddhāvataṃsaka*; the corresponding passage is indeed to be found in this chapter (both Chinese and Tibetan). The Chinese *Ratnagotravibhāgavyākhyā* does not assign a title to the other citation, but the passage quoted is almost same as the *Tathāgatotpattisambhava* chapter of the Chinese *Buddhāvataṃsaka* (Buddhabhadra’s version), suggesting that the translator(s) must have been aware of the relationship between the citation and the *Buddhāvataṃsaka*. In his English translation of the Tibetan *Ratnagotravibhāgavyākhyā*, Obermiller attributes the second quotation to the *Jñānālokaṣaṅkārāsūtra*, where there is a very close parallel. It is not uncommon for different sūtras to share the same passages, so that it is impossible to say which was the original source. For Obermiller’s translation, see E. Obermiller, “The Sublime Science of the Great Vehicle to Salvation, Being a Manual of Buddhist Monism: The Work of Arya Maitreya with a Commentary by Aryasanga, translated from the Tibetan with introduction and notes,” *Acta Orientalia*, vol. 9, 1931, pp. 81–306.

⁶⁰ D 4025, 75a7–b1: *De bzhin gshegs pa'i yon tan dang ye shes bsam gyis mi khyab pa'i yul la 'jug pa bstan pa*; cf. Johnston (1950): p. 3.7–9.

Sūtrasamuccaya.⁶¹

(3) Vasubandhu's *Vyākhyāyukti*

Vasubandhu's (320–400)⁶² *Vyākhyāyukti* is only preserved in Tibetan translation,⁶³ done by Viśuddhasiṃha, Śākyasiṃha and Devendrarakṣita during early spread of Buddhism in Tibet. Vasubandhu appeals to two members of the *Buddhāvataṃsaka* family, the *Lokottaraparivarta* and the *Tathāgatotpattisambhava*, as authorities.⁶⁴ Although he only invokes their titles, this nonetheless indicates the importance of these two sūtras, and suggests that in Vasubandhu's time and intellectual milieu, Indian scholars were acquainted with them.

(4) Śāntideva's *Śikṣāsamuccaya*

The *Śikṣāsamuccaya* of Śāntideva (c. 650–750)⁶⁵ is the greatest compendium of Mahāyāna sūtras available in Sanskrit.⁶⁶ The original Tibetan translation done by Jinamitra, Dānaśīla, and Ye shes sde was later revised by the “Kashmiri paṇḍita” Tilakakalaśa and the Tibetan Bhikṣu Blo Idan shes rab. Several texts of the *Buddhāvataṃsaka* family were important sources for Śāntideva, in that he cites them more than once and cites them at length. He does not, however, relate them to a broader *Buddhāvataṃsaka* category: rather, he cites them under their individual titles:

[1] *Gocarapariśuddhisūtra*

[2] *Ratnolkādhārāṇī*

[3] *Vajradhvajasūtra*

⁶¹ Cf. Pāsādika (1989), p. 202.6–9.

⁶² Date after Nakamura (1980), p. 268.

⁶³ For a critical edition, see Jong Cheol Lee [李鐘徹], *The Tibetan Text of the Vyākhyāyukti of Vasubandhu, Critically Edited from the Cone, Derge, Narthang and Peking Editions* (Bibliotheca Indologica et Buddhologica 8), Tokyo: The Sankibo Press, 2001. For a general overview, see P. Skilling, “A Survey of the Vyākhyāyukti Literature,” *Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies* 23/2 (2000), pp. 297–350. For an English translation of chapter 1, see Richard F. Nance, *Speaking for Buddhas: Scriptural Commentary in Indian Buddhism*, New York: Columbia University Press, 2012, Appendix A, pp. 129–152.

⁶⁴ 'Jig rten las 'das pa'i le'u (D 4061, 113a4; Lee, 246.6) and *de bzhin gshegs pa skye ba bstan pa'i mdo* (D 4061, 114a4; Lee, 248.22); see also the *Vyākhyāyuktiṭīkā*: 'jig rten las 'das pa'i le'u (D 4069, 277b2) and *de bzhin gshegs pa skye ba bstan pa'i mdo* (D 4069, 278a3; 286a2–3).

⁶⁵ Date after Nakamura (1980), p. 287. Ruegg (1981, p. 82) gives “flourished probably in the first part of the eighth century.”

⁶⁶ Cecil Bendall (ed.), *Śikṣāsamuccaya: A Compendium of Buddhist Teaching compiled by Śāntideva chiefly from earlier Mahāyāna-sūtras* (Bibliotheca Buddhica I), St. Pétersbourg: Imperial Academy of Sciences, 1897–1902 (repr. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass Publishers Pvt. Ltd.). For the author Śāntideva, see recently, with references to earlier literature, Paul Harrison, “The Case of the Vanishing Poet. New Light on Śāntideva and the *Śikṣā-samuccaya*,” in Konrad Klaus and Jens-Uwe Hartmann (eds.), *Indica et Tibetica: Festschrift für Michael Hahn: zum 65. Geburtstag von Freunden und Schülern überreicht* (Wiener Studien zur Tibetologie und Buddhismuskunde, Heft 66), Vienna: Arbeitskreis für tibetische und buddhistische Studien, Universität Wien, 2007, pp. 215–248.

[4] *Daśabhūmikasūtra*

[5] *Lokottaraparivarta*

[6] *Gaṇḍavyūha*

[7] *Śraddhābalādhānāvatāramudrā*.

The *Śikṣāsamuccaya* mentions only the title of the *Gocarapariśuddhisūtra*, which is also cited in the *Mahāsūtrasamuccaya*⁶⁷ and in the second or middle *Bhāvanākrama*.⁶⁸ Both citations are very brief, and cannot be traced anywhere in the corresponding chapter of the *Buddhāvataṃsaka*. It is not impossible that they refer to another sūtra with the same title.

In his *Mahāyānaśāṅgrahabhāṣya*, Vasubandhu quotes a sūtra entitled *Spyod lam yongs su dag pa'i mdo* as an authority;⁶⁹ this should be the same *Gocarapariśuddhisūtra*. In his commentary on the *Mahāyānaśāṅgraha*, the *Mahāyānaśāṅgrahopanibandhana*, the Indian master Asvabhāva (approximately fifth century?) quotes a sūtra under the title *Spyod yul yongs su dag pa'i mdo* in the corresponding places,⁷⁰ including one sentence which may be traced to chapter 16 of the Tibetan *Buddhāvataṃsaka*. In his *Sūtrālamkāravākhyā*, Vasubandhu also invokes the authority of a sūtra entitled *Spyod yul yongs su dag pa'i mdo*.⁷¹

The title *Tathāgatagocarapariśuddhi* does occur in both the *Lhan dkar ma*⁷² and the 'Phang thang ma'⁷³ registers, but in the Mahāyāna sūtra section rather than the *Buddhāvataṃsaka* section. The Sanskrit and Tibetan titles are also listed in the *Mahāvvyutpatti*.⁷⁴ The Tanjur preserves a short summary of this text entitled “Compendium of the meaning of the *Bodhisatvagocarapariśuddhisūtra*” (*Bodhisatvagocarapariśuddhisūtrārthasaṅgraha*, D 3965); the author is given as Rāhulabhadra,⁷⁵ and the translation ascribed to Śākyaśrībhadrā and Gnubs Byams pa'i dpal. The *Bodhisatvagocarapariśuddhisūtrārthasaṅgraha* is indeed a summary of the contents of a text similar to chapter 16 of the Tibetan *Buddhāvataṃsaka*.

⁶⁷ D 3961, 78b3–5.

⁶⁸ D 3916, 54a5–6.

⁶⁹ D 4050, 157a2.

⁷⁰ D 4051, 240b3.

⁷¹ D 4026, 144b3; cf. Lévi (1907) p. 21.17 = Lévi (1911) p. 48.11 (Sylvain Lévi [ed.], *Mahāyāna-Sūtrālaṅkāra, Exposé de la doctrine du Grand véhicule*, Paris: Champion, 1907, 1911; Kyoto: Rinsen Book Co, 1983 [reprint], in two volumes).

⁷² No.165: 'Phags pa de bzhin gshegs pa'i spyod yul yongs su dag pa.

⁷³ No.145 and no. 713: *De bzhin gshegs pa'i spyod yul yongs su dag pa*. In the 'Phang thang ma, this title occurs twice, one (no. 145) under the section of Mahāsūtra (*Mdo chen po'i tshar*), the other (no. 713) in a section reserved for texts for which the information could not be confirmed by more than one register (for this category, see Halkias, op. cit., p. 73).

⁷⁴ S 1376: *Gocarapariśuddham, Spyod yul yongs su dag pa*.

⁷⁵ The identity of this Rāhulabhadra is not at all clear, for example, whether he can be the same as the Rāhulabhadra mentioned in connection with Nāgārjuna and the Madhyamaka tradition, whose identity and date are, at any rate, obscure. See David Seyfort Ruegg (1981), pp. 54–56.

At present we cannot assume that all of the quotations mentioned above necessarily indicate one and same text, or that they necessarily refer to counterparts of chapter 16 of the Tibetan *Buddhāvataṃsaka*. We can only conclude that a text bearing the title *Gocaraparīśuddhisūtra* was important and authoritative among Indian Buddhist scholars from the fourth to ninth centuries CE, and that in some cases this text has a counterpart in the *Buddhāvataṃsaka*.

The *Śikṣāsamuccaya* cites the *Ratnolūkadhāraṇī* four times; the parallels can be traced both in the independent Tibetan translation of the sūtra itself and in the Tibetan *Buddhāvataṃsaka* (three times in chapter 17, all in verse, and once in chapter 20). One of these citations is perhaps the longest quotation in the whole *Śikṣāsamuccaya*, and the other three reproduce almost the entire chapter 17 of the *Buddhāvataṃsaka* – we can conclude that the *Ratnolūkadhāraṇī* was one of Śāntideva's most favoured texts. In the *Ratnolūkadhāraṇī*, the corresponding part of chapter 20 of the *Buddhāvataṃsaka* precedes chapter 17. The relationships between the *Ratnolūkadhāraṇī* and the *Buddhāvataṃsaka* need further investigation.⁷⁶

Śāntideva mentions the *Vajradhvaṃsajñāna* five times. He gives four quotations, all of them quite long; the fifth and last only invokes the title. In his *Bodhisatvacaryāvatāra* (chapter 7, verse 46), Śāntideva recommends following “the method of Vajradhvaṃsajñāna” (*vajradhvaṃsajñāna vidhinā*), one of few texts explicitly recommended in the whole *Bodhisatvacaryāvatāra*.⁷⁷ The fact that he refers to the *Vajradhvaṃsajñāna* in both of his main works demonstrates the importance of the *Vajradhvaṃsajñāna* to Śāntideva.

The title *Vajradhvaṃsajñāna* occurs in both the *Lhan dkar ma*⁷⁸ and the *'Phang thang ma*⁷⁹ registers under *Smon lam sna tshogs* (Assorted *prañidhānas*, a section made up of usually short aspirations). The two registers state that it has eighteen verses. Bcom ldan rig pa'i ral gri's catalogue also lists a text with the same title,⁸⁰ but Bu ston Rin chen grub's catalogue does not. The Derge and Peking Kanjurs do not include a work of this title, but it is included in the Stog Palace,⁸¹ Ulan Bator,⁸² Shel dkar,⁸³ Phug brag,⁸⁴

⁷⁶ For the complexity of the piecemeal evolution of the *Buddhāvataṃsaka* family in Chinese translation see for example Nattier, “The Proto-History.”

⁷⁷ Here Prajñākaramati refers to the title *Vajradhvaṃsajñāna* in his commentary on the verse. See P.L. Vaidya (ed.), *Bodhisatvacaryāvatāra of Śāntideva with the Commentary Pañjikā of Prajñākaramati* (Buddhist Sanskrit Texts No. 12), Darbhanga: Mithila Institute of Post-Graduate Studies and Research in Sanskrit Learning, 1960, p. 128.1 (note the misprint in the verse itself, p. 127 ult. – *vajradhvaṃsajñāna* instead of *vajradhvaṃsajñāna*).

⁷⁸ [468] *'Phags pa rdo rje rgyal mtshan gyi bsngo ba*.

⁷⁹ [447] *Rdo rje rgyal mtshan gyi bsngo ba*.

⁸⁰ *Rdo rje rgyal mtshan gyi bsngo ba bcwa brgyad*, cf. Schaeffer and van der Kuijp (2009), p. 152.

⁸¹ Skorupski (1985), no. 327, p. 166.

⁸² Bethlenfalvy (1982), no. 373, p. 34.

⁸³ Pagel and Gaffney (1996), no. 243, p. 47.

⁸⁴ Jampa Samten (1992), no. 253, p. 97.

Gondhla,⁸⁵ and Bathang⁸⁶ Kanjurs. The Mustang Kanjur catalogue lists two texts with a similar title.⁸⁷ Two copies of this text, one complete and another incomplete, are preserved among the Dunhuang manuscripts.⁸⁸ Only the incomplete Dunhuang manuscript opens with own title in “the language of India” (*rgya gar skad du*), and all of them lack translators’ colophons. Judging from the contents, the Kanjur version and the Dunhuang manuscripts represent same text, but are different recensions. The fact that the two versions are different, but contain the same contents, leads us to conclude that this is a genuine translation of an Indic text and not an early Tibetan composition.⁸⁹ This text should be associated with the *Buddhāvataṃsaka*.⁹⁰ In his *Catalogue of Sanskrit Manuscripts*, Bendall notes that the last folio of one *Prajñāpāramitā* text contains a short treatise ending *Vajradhajapariṇāma* (= *Vajradhvaja*?) *nāma samāptā*. It is possible that this is a Sanskrit – or even Prakrit? – *Vajradhvajapariṇāma*.⁹¹

Śāntideva cites the *Lokottaraparivarta* once, the *Śraddhābalādhānāvātāramudrā* four times, the *Daśabhūmikasūtra* nine times, and the *Gaṇḍavyūha* sixteen times, both as *Gaṇḍavyūha* and by individual *vimokṣas*.

(5) Kamalaśīla’s *Bhāvanākrama* (First, Middle, and Last)

The three *Bhāvanākramas* of Kamalaśīla (c. 740–795)⁹² were translated by Prajñāvarman and Ye shes sde.⁹³ The *Bhāvanākrama* is not an anthology, but it regularly makes short citations to support or illustrate points. Kamalaśīla quotes at least the following *Buddhāvataṃsaka* texts:

[1] *Gocarapariśuddhisūtra*

[2] *Daśabhūmika*

⁸⁵ Tauscher (2008), no. 35.41, p. 108.

⁸⁶ Eimer (2012), no. 161, p. 112.

⁸⁷ ‘*Phags rdo rje rgyal mtshan yongs su bsngo ba*’i mdo and *Rdo rje rgyal mtshan gyi bsngo ba*, cf. Eimer (1999), no. 516, p. 97; no. 603, p. 107.

⁸⁸ La Vallée Poussin (1962), no. 179 (complete), p. 65. Marcelle Lalou, *Inventaire des Manuscrits tibétains de Touen-houang conservés à la Bibliothèque Nationale* (Fonds Pelliot tibétain) Nos. 1–849, I, Paris: Librairie d’Amérique et d’Orient Adrien-Maisonneuve, 1939, no. 740 (incomplete), p. 163.

⁸⁹ This might become clear when the Cambridge Sanskrit folio becomes available (see n. 91 below). Here, as in the case of the independent translation of the *Daśabhūmika*, we meet a text which is “lost” in the Tshal pa branch, but is preserved in a manuscript from Dunhuang and in the Them spangs ma branch. The question of the inclusion and exclusion of texts in different Kanjurs needs further research.

⁹⁰ Jampa Samten describes this title as an “abridged version” of *Buddhāvataṃsaka*, chapter 30: see Jampa Samten (1992), p. 97, n. 1.

⁹¹ Cecil Bendall, *Catalogue of the Buddhist Sanskrit Manuscripts in the University Library, Cambridge*, Cambridge: 1883; Stuttgart: Steiner, 1992 (reprinted), pp. 151–152, Add. 1643.

⁹² Date after Ruegg (1981), p. 93, Nakamura (1980, p. 281) suggests c. 700–750.

⁹³ Cf. Giuseppe Tucci, *Minor Buddhist Texts, Part II. First Bhāvanākrama of Kamalaśīla: Sanskrit and Tibetan Texts with Introduction and English Summary* (Serie Orientale Roma 9.2), Roma: Istituto Italiano per il Medio ed Estremo Oriente, 1958, and idem, *Minor Buddhist Texts, Part III. Third Bhāvanākrama* (Serie Orientale Roma 43), Roma: Istituto Italiano per il Medio ed Estremo Oriente, 1971.

[3] *Tathāgatotpattisambhavasūtra*

[4] *Lokottaraparivarta*

[5] *Gaṇḍavyūha*

[6] *Bhadracaryāpraṇidhāna*

[7] *Āryaśraddhābalādhāna*.

Generally speaking, Kamalaśīla does not cite *Buddhāvataṃsaka* texts very frequently, and when he does, the quotations are so brief or abbreviated that sometimes they are difficult to locate. Some quotations overlap with (or may be drawn from) the *Śikṣāsamuccaya*.

(6) Kamalaśīla's *Madhyamakāloka*

The *Madhyamakāloka* was translated by Śīlendrabodhi and Dpal brtsegs rakṣita in the early period of translation. In this text, Kamalaśīla cites the *Lokottaraparivarta* once,⁹⁴ the *Daśabhūmika* twice,⁹⁵ and the *Gaṇḍavyūha* once.⁹⁶ The same citations also occur in his first *Bhāvanākrama* and in the *Sūtrasamuccaya*, with the exception of those from the *Daśabhūmika*.

(7) Bhavya's⁹⁷ *Madhyamakahrdayatarkajvālā*

In his *Madhyamakahrdayatarkajvālā*, translated by Jo bo rje (Atiśa) and Tshul khriims rgyal ba in the eleventh century, Bhavya (c. 490—570)⁹⁸ cites the *Lokottaraparivarta* one time⁹⁹ and the *Daśabhūmika* four times.¹⁰⁰ All of the citations are short or abbreviated.

Further evidence for the circulation of the Buddhāvataṃsaka

Looking more broadly, we find tangible evidence of the circulation of the texts belonging to the *Buddhāvataṃsaka* family in central Asia, in the form of Sanskrit manuscript fragments from Khotan (fifth, more probably the sixth century), on the southern Silk route.¹⁰¹ In about the eighth century, the *Gaṇḍavyūha* spread to central Java, where, carved in full detail on the great stone monument of Borobudur, it is a masterpiece of

⁹⁴ D 3887: 'Phags pa 'jig rten las 'das pa'i le'u (158b2–3) = First *Bhāvanākrama*, cf. Tucci (1958), p. 217.9–11.

⁹⁵ D 3887: 'Phags pa sa bcu pa (145b1; 158b5–7).

⁹⁶ D 3887: 'Phags pa sdong pos brgyan pa (238a1–7) = Pāsādika (1989): p. 132.5–133.9.

⁹⁷ The author's name is uncertain, we follow the form given in the Tanjur for this work. Recently some scholars have preferred the form Bhāviveka.

⁹⁸ Date after Nakamura (1980), p. 284, Ruegg (1981, p. 61) gives c. 500–570 with a question mark.

⁹⁹ D 3856: 'Jig rten las 'das pa'i le'u (186b3–187a2); so far we could not locate this short passage in the Tibetan *Buddhāvataṃsaka*.

¹⁰⁰ D 3856: *Sa bcu pa'i mdo* (53a4–5); *de bzhin gshegs pa'i sa bcu pa'i mdo* (144b5); *sa bcu pa la sogs pa'i mdo sde* (144b6); *sa bcu pa'i mdo sde* (207b6–208a1).

¹⁰¹ Karashima and Wille (2009), *ibid.* p. 28; Hori (2012).

world art. At Nalanda, a tenth-century verse inscription from the *Bhadracarī* was engraved on a stone *caitya*.¹⁰²

It can be conclusively said that the texts of the *Buddhāvataṃsaka* family circulated in Sanskrit in Central Asia in the sixth centuries. In India, they circulated from the fourth to ninth centuries; the *śāstras* studied here indicate that they were highly esteemed as authoritative sources. Two texts, the *Daśabhūmika* and the *Gaṇḍavyūha*, maintained independent existences in India and Nepal, where they led ritual lives of their own which led to their survival in numerous manuscripts.¹⁰³ The other members, significantly present in the intellectual world of neighbouring regions of India and Tibet, at least up to the eighth or ninth centuries, apparently lost their status, ceased to be copied, and did not survive. The reasons for this remain to be explained.

This result is also important for the study of the evolution of language. The verses of the *Buddhāvataṃsaka* family of texts are all in Buddhist Sanskrit: *Daśabhūmika*, *Gaṇḍavyūha*, *Bhadracarī*, and also *Ratnolūkādharmaṇī*. Further studies are here required, along with individual glossaries of the *sūtras* that are fully preserved and of those that survive in citation. This would facilitate comparative studies. At present we can conclude that the prose sections are in “Buddhist hybrid prose” – that is, a particular Sanskritized literary language that draws heavily on a Prakritic substratum – and the verse sections are in the “*gāthā* language” or “Buddhist Sanskrit verse.”

Beyond the sections discussed above, there is so far no Sanskrit manuscript evidence for the rest of the *Buddhāvataṃsaka*, either as a whole or its remaining parts. This has led to the questioning of the Indian credentials of the *Buddhāvataṃsaka*. Some researchers have suggested that some parts may have been composed in Central Asia. The fact that the manuscripts circulated in India does not alone disprove the Khotanese or Central Asian origin theories, but the sustained circulation and high visibility of members of the *Buddhāvataṃsaka* family in India, coupled with the regular use of hybrid Sanskrit verse – the ‘*gāthā* language’ – as a natural complement to the prose makes this, it seems to us, highly unlikely.¹⁰⁴

The situation in India seems to have stayed much the same at the time that the *Buddhāvataṃsaka* texts were introduced to the Land of Snows. The early Tibetan

¹⁰² See Gregory Schopen, “A Verse from the *Bhadracariprañidhāna* in a Tenth-Century Inscription Found at Nālandā,” *Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies*, vol. 12, part 1, 1989, pp. 149–157, reprinted in Gregory Schopen, *Figments and Fragments of Mahāyāna Buddhism in India: More Collected Papers*, Honolulu: University of Hawai‘i Press, 2005, pp. 299–305.

¹⁰³ For the recitation of the *Gaṇḍavyūha* and *Daśabhūmika* in India, see T. Ganapati Shastri (ed.), *Ārya Mañjuśrīmūlakalpaḥ* [1920] repr. CBH Publications, Trivandrum, 1992, pp. 38.12, 99.9, 109.28 – see also Ariane MacDonald, *Le Maṇḍala du Mañjuśrīmūlakalpa* (Collection Jean Przyluski 3), Paris: Adrien-Maisonneuve, 1962, pp. 102–103.

¹⁰⁴ To propose a Central Asian composition of the component texts is tantamount to proposing Central Asian origins for hybrid Sanskrit, with the implication that it developed within an Iranian rather than a middle-Indic substratum.

registers record the same titles, but treat them as, if not quite independent, then as autonomous texts, with their own titles and measurements of length. It is true that they are grouped under the broader category *Buddhāvataṃsaka*, but each text has its own identity. This is different from the extant Kanjurs, in which the same texts become chapters, merged in the great, continuous *Buddhāvataṃsaka*. The question that remains is when, and why, did the merger occur?

Appendix

MAIN CITATIONS OF THE *BUDDHĀVATAṂSAKA* IN INDIAN BUDDHIST LITERATURE
AS ATTESTED IN SANSKRIT VERSIONS AND TIBETAN TRANSLATIONSI. Members of the *Buddhāvataṃsaka* family cited or referred to in Indian works*SŪTRASAMUCCAYA*1. *Daśabhūmikasūtra* / *Sa bcu'i mdo sde*

Pāsādika (1989): pp. 199.2–200.18 = „Linh-Son“ – *Publication d'Études Bouddhologiques* (Institut de Recherche Bouddhique Linh-Son, Paris = LSPEB) 20, pp. 34.21–35.20

2. *Tathāgatopattisambhavasūtra* / *De bzhin gshegs pa skye ba srid pa'i mdo*

Pāsādika (1989): pp. 113.6–120.5 = LSPEB 13, pp. 37.26–41.29

3. *Lokottaraparivarta* / 'Jig rten las 'das pa'i le'u

Pāsādika (1989): p. 121.22–24 = LSPEB 13, p. 42.13–15

4. *Gaṇḍavyūhasūtra* / *Sdong po bkod pa'i mdo*

Pāsādika (1989): pp. 3.22–4.4 = LSPEB 2, pp. 22.42–23.2;

pp. 15.17–19.13 = LSPEB 3, pp. 34.9–36.30;

pp. 190.12–194.19 = LSPEB 19, pp. 59.27–61.43;

pp. 194.20–198.20 = LSPEB 20, p. 32.11–15;

pp. 100.22–103.12 (*dpal 'byung ba dang* | *dpal gyi blo gros kyi rnam par thar pa*) = LSPEB 12, pp. 32.8–33.24;¹⁰⁵

pp. 132.5–133.16 (*sdong po bkod pa'i rnam par thar pa*) = LSPEB 14, pp. 22.27–23.36

5. *Tathāgataṇaṇjānācintyaṣaṣyāvātāranirdeśa* / *De bzhin gshegs pa'i yon tan dang ye shes bsam gyis mi khyab pa'i yul la 'jug pa bstan pa'i mdo*

Pāsādika (1989): p. 14.11–15.12 = LSPEB 3, p. 33.1–21;

pp. 200.19–202.9 = LSPEB 20, pp. 35.21–36.19

6. *Buddhāvataṃsakasūtra* / *Sangs rgyas phal po che'i mdo*

Pāsādika (1989): pp. 154.22–156.2 = LSPEB 16, pp. 26.32–27.37 = D 201 37a7–b6;

pp. 202.11–206.17 = LSPEB 20, pp. 36.20–39.23 = D 201 49a6–b7;

pp. 206.23–207.22 (*mdo 'di nyid*) = LSPEB 20, pp. 39.30–40.17 = D 201 61b4–62a2

7. *Śraddhābalādhānāvātāramudrā* / *Dad pa'i stobs bskyed pa la 'jug pa'i phyag rgya'i mdo*

Pāsādika (1989): p. 11.12–25 (*Dad pa'i stobs bskyed pa'i mdo*) = LSPEB 2, p. 27.3–18;

p. 12.1–14 (*yang de nyid*) = LSPEB 3, p. 31.9–24;

pp. 133.20–134.12 (*Dad pa'i stobs bskyed pa'i mdo*) = LSPEB 14, pp. 23.40–24.15;¹⁰⁶

pp. 32.14–35.19 (*Dad pa'i stobs bskyed pa la 'jug pa'i phyag rgya'i mdo*) = LSPEB 5, pp. 24.11–26.14;

pp. 38.2–40.12 = LSPEB 6, pp. 28.2–29.22

*ŚIKṢĀSAMUCCAYA*1. *Gocarapariśuddhisūtra*

Bendall (1902): 350.21¹⁰⁷

¹⁰⁵ This is a condensed quotation.

¹⁰⁶ We have not been able to trace any of the three passages with the title *Dad pa'i stobs bskyed pa'i mdo* in the Kanjur version. Note that there are discrepancies in the title, and it could be a different sūtra.

¹⁰⁷ This is a reference by title without citation: *evam ayaṃ ... sarvāvasthāsu satvārthaḥ ... puṇyavṛdhihetuḥ | vistaratatvāryagocarapariśuddhisūtre draṣṭavyaḥ*.

2. *Ratnolkādhāraṇī*

Bendall (1902): 2.15–5.1 = Chapter 17 of the Tibetan *Buddhāvataṃsaka*;

p. 5.3–6 (... *tat parisamāpya saṃkṣepataḥ punar āha* | ...) ¹⁰⁸ = Chapter 17 of the Tibetan *Buddhāvataṃsaka*;

p. 153.11–15 = Chapter 20 of the Tibetan *Buddhāvataṃsaka*;

pp. 327.5–347.11 = Chapter 17 of the Tibetan *Buddhāvataṃsaka*

3. *Vajradhvaṣasūtra*

Bendall (1902): 22.5–27.3; ¹⁰⁹

27.4–33.10 (... *punar atraivāha* | ...); ¹¹⁰

213.3–216.5 (*Vajradhvaṣaparīṇāmanāyām uktā* ...);

278.14–283.2 (*Āryavajradhvaṣasūtre 'py āha* ...);

291.10 ¹¹¹

4. *Daśabhūmikasūtra*

Bendall (1902): 10.15–11.1; 11.3–4 (*pramuditāyām tu paṭhyate* ...); 11.4–8 (*evam ādisūtreṣu* ...); 11.10–11; 126.9–14; 227.11–228.6; 287.14–288.11; 288.11–289.10 (... *tathātraivāha* | ...); 291.11–296.1

5. *Lokottaraparivarta*

Bendall (1902): 151.13–152.19

6. *Gaṇḍavyūha*

Bendall (1902): 2.3; 5.20–6.8; 8.16–18; 9.8–12; 34.18–36.4; 36.4–8; 95.6–10; 101.13–104.8; 122.15–123.12; 149.7–10; 154.1; 177.14–178.8; 180.15–17; 276.10–278.3; 296.2–11; 310.1–311.4

7. *Śraddhābalādhānāvātāramudrā*

Bendall (1902): 86.1–13; 87.4–13; 153.16–18; 311.6–12

BHĀVANĀKRAMA1. *Gocarapariśuddhisūtra*

The second Bhāvanākrama: D 3916 54a5–6 ('*Phags pa spyod yul yongs su dag pa'i mdo*) ¹¹²

2. *Daśabhūmika*

Tucci (1958): 195.10–11

Tucci (1971): 21.14–16 (*Daśabhūmika*); ¹¹³ 24.15–17 ¹¹⁴

3. *Tathāgatopattisambhavasūtra*

Tucci (1971): 13.2–6

4. *Lokottaraparivarta*

Tucci (1958): 217.9–11

5. *Gaṇḍavyūha*

Tucci (1958): 191.2–9 (*tathā cokaṭṭhaṃ maitreyavimokṣe* ...) = Bendall (1902): 9.8–12;

¹⁰⁸ The citation is condensed, omitting three verses.

¹⁰⁹ The citation is selective.

¹¹⁰ The *Bodhicaryāvatārapañjikā* also quotes the passage from *sa tāni kuśalamūlāni* (29.13) to *sukhacittaḥ parīṇāmayati* (30.2): see Vaidya (1960), p. 39.6–14.

¹¹¹ Only the title is mentioned.

¹¹² We have not been able to trace the passage in the Kanjur version.

¹¹³ This is a condensed citation.

¹¹⁴ We have not been able to trace the passage in the Kanjur version.

192.19–193.1 = Bendall (1902): 8.16–18;

192.16–17; 228.19–21

6. *Bhadracaryāprañidhāna*

Tucci (1958): 221.2¹¹⁵

7. *Āryaśraddhābalādhāna*

Tucci (1958): 187.17–19; 195.4–6

II. Distribution of citations from the *Buddhāvataṃsaka* family in Indian works

1. *Gocarapariśuddhisūtra* / *Spyod yul yongs su dag pa'i mdo*

Śikṣāsamuccaya (1); *Sūtrālamkāravayākhyā* (1); *Mahāyānaśaṅgrahabhāṣya* (1); *Mahāyānaśaṅgrahopanibandhana* (1); *Second Bhāvanākrama* (1)

2. *Ratnolkādhāraṇī* / *Dkon mchog ta la la'i gzungs*

Śikṣāsamuccaya (4)

3. *Vajradhavasūtra* / *Rdo rje rgyal mtshan gyi mdo*

Śikṣāsamuccaya (5); *Bodhisatvacaryāvatāra* (1); *Bodhicaryāvatārapañjikā* (2)

4. *Daśabhūmikasūtra* / *Sa bcu'i mdo*

Sūtrasamuccaya (1); *Śikṣāsamuccaya* (9); *Madhyamakahrdayatarkajvālā* (4); *First Bhāvanākrama* (1); *Third Bhāvanākrama* (2); *Madhyamakāloka* (1)

5. *Tathāgatopattisambhavasūtra* / *De bzhin gshegs pa skye ba srid pa'i mdo*

Sūtrasamuccaya (1); *Ratnagotravibhāgavyākhyā* (2); *Vyākhyāyukti* (1); *Vyākhyāyuktiṭīkā* (2); *Third Bhāvanākrama* (1)

6. *Lokottaraparivarta* / *'Jig rten las 'das pa'i le'u*

Sūtrasamuccaya (1); *Vyākhyāyukti* (1); *Vyākhyāyuktiṭīkā* (1); *Śikṣāsamuccaya* (1); *Madhyamakahrdayatarkajvālā* (1); *First Bhāvanākrama* (1); *Madhyamakāloka* (1)

7. *Gaṇḍavyūhasūtra* / *Sdong po bkod pa'i mdo*

Sūtrasamuccaya (6); *Śikṣāsamuccaya* (16); *First Bhāvanākrama* (4); *Madhyamakāloka* (1)

8. *Bhadracaryāprañidhāna* / *'Phags pa bzang po spyod pa (smon lam)*

First Bhāvanākrama (1)

9. *Tathāgataṇḍajñānācintyaviśayāvatāranirdeśa* / *De bzhin gshegs pa'i yon tan dang ye shes bsam gyis mi khyab pa'i yul la 'jug pa bstan pa'i mdo*

Sūtrasamuccaya (2); *Ratnagotravibhāgavyākhyā* (1)

10. *Buddhāvataṃsakasūtra* / *Sangs rgyas phal po che'i mdo*

Sūtrasamuccaya (3)

11. *Śraddhābalādhānāvatāramudrā* / *Dad pa'i stobs bskyed pa la 'jug pa'i phyag rgya'i mdo*

Sūtrasamuccaya (5); *Śikṣāsamuccaya* (4); *First Bhāvanākrama* (2)

III. Circulation of the *Buddhāvataṃsaka* family in Indian works: A tentative chronology

The table is meant to give a general overview of the circulation of texts in the *Buddhāvataṃsaka* family as outlined in this article. Given the uncertainties of dating, the chronology is *tentative*, in particular that of what so far is potentially the oldest source, the *Sūtrasamuccaya*. If an early date of *Sūtrasamuccaya* is rejected, then the earliest evidence for the use of the texts as authorities becomes the fourth century, by which time several titles are attested. From then on, the texts are regularly cited. Unfortunately, it is impossible to locate the sūtras' activities on the map of India, given that we know so little about the authors of the śāstras and their careers.

¹¹⁵ This is a reference to the title only, without citation.

DATE	Title	ŚĀSTRA
150–250 CE	Gaṇḍavyūhasūtra	Sūtrasamuccaya
	Tathāgataḡaṇajñānācintyaṡayāvatāranirdeśa	
	Tathāgatotpattisambhavasūtra	
	Daśabhūmikasūtra	
	Lokottaraparivarta	
	Śraddhābalādhānāvatāramudrā	
320–400 CE	Gocarapariśuddhisūtra	Mahāyānasaṅgrahabhāṡya
		Sūtrālaṃkāravākhyā
	Tathāgatotpattisambhava	Vyākhyāyukti
	Lokottaraparivarta	
350–450 CE	Tathāgataḡaṇajñānācintyaṡayāvatāranirdeśa	Ratnagotravibhāḡavyākhyā
	Tathāgatotpattisambhava	
500–570 CE	Daśabhūmika	Madhyamakahrdayatarkajvālā
	Lokottaraparivarta	
650–750 CE	Gaṇḍavyūha	Śikṡāsamuccaya
	Gocarapariśuddhisūtra	
	Daśabhūmikasūtra	
	Ratnolkādharaṇī	
	Lokottaraparivarta	
	Vajradhvaṡasūtra	
	Śraddhābalādhānāvatāramudrā	
740–795 CE	Gaṇḍavyūha	Bhāvanākrama
	Daśabhūmika	
	Gocarapariśuddhisūtra	
	Tathāgatotpattisambhavasūtra	
	Bhadracaryāpraṇidhāna	
	Lokottaraparivarta	
	Śraddhābalādhānāvatāramudrā	